

**REMARKS****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUL 24 2006****Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action**

5 The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claims 4, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC §112 first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

10 The specification and claims have been amended to correctly indicate that the dividing wall extends between the side edge and the fold line, not the side edge and the bottom line. This description matches that which is shown in the Figures and no revised figures are believed to be required.

The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection/rejection.

15 **Paragraph 3 of the Office Action**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 1,928,337 to McClanahan in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,716,948 to Brissette.

20 It is respectfully submitted to the Examiner that McClanahan does not teach transparent windows positioned on either side of *a compartment* for viewing into the compartment but teaches a pocket made of transparent sheets. McClanahan clearly teaches a panel 10 attached to a pair of transparent sheets 14 and 15 that form a pocket. As shown in Figure 3 of McClanahan, this requires a plastic panel 14 to be attached directly to the panel 10. Such a connection is not advantageous because it relies on the  
25 plastic material to remain pliable. After been used, even rather infrequently, this portion of plastic will crack and break apart from the panel. This is not a concern for McClanahan because that device is used for monitoring work done on a vehicle, such as for tracking oil changes. Thus, the McClanahan device will rarely be used and when not in use will most likely be positioned within a glove compartment or other compartment of  
30 a vehicle. It will therefore rarely be subject to external forces.

The applicant's device, to the contrary, will be subject to continual bending and opening as its usefulness relates to holding travel documents, which can be readily accessed and read. For this reason, the applicant's first slot is spaced from the window in the first side whereas McClanahan's slot between sheets 14 and 15 is formed by a free  
5 edge of those sheets. The applicant's claims 1 and 8 have been amended to further include the limitation of the pocket being constructed of a non-transparent material. This limitation is readily apparent from the applicant's figures and the applicant's specification, which states that a leather material may be used for the pocket, and therefore no new material has been added. For the above reasons it is believed that all  
10 claims are in condition for allowance.

With respect to Brissette, it is respectfully submitted to the Examiner that McClanahan leaves no room for additional slots or pockets. Figure 3 of McClanahan clearly shows that only two pockets are formed and these pockets take up the entirety of the McClanahan device. Therefore, the combination as put forward by the Examiner is  
15 an impossibility and must be nonobvious. For this reason, claim 1 is again believed to be allowable over the prior art.

The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**Paragraph 4 of the Office Action**

20 Claims 2, 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,059,052 to Casper.

For the reasons stated above, it is believed that claims 2, 3 and 6 are allowable over the combination as stated by the Examiner.

25 Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested by the applicant.

**Paragraph 5 of the Office Action**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number  
30 4,890,728 to Grimsley.

It is respectfully submitted to the Examiner that Grimsley does not show a flap but instead shows a pocket divided into three distinct, and approximately equal sections. Thus, Grimsley does not teach nor anticipate a flap as claimed by the applicant. For this reason, it is believed that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

5       The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.


**CONCLUSION**

5

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early consideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

10



Sean A. Kaufhold (Reg. No. 46,820)

P.O. Box 89626

15

Sioux Falls, SD 57109

(605) 334-1571 FAX (605) 334-1574

Date: 7/24/06